

On the Spin-Hall effect in a dirty Rashba semiconductor

O.Bleibaum*

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Otto-von-Guericke Universität, 39016 Magdeburg, Germany

The impact of the boundary condition on the solution of the spin diffusion equations in a dirty Rashba semiconductor is reinvestigated. To this end first diffusion equations, which take into account the coupling between spin and charge, are derived. The investigation of the solution to the spin-diffusion equation near the boundary shows that the spin-current tensor vanishes discontinuously at the boundary. As a consequence, there is no spin-Hall effect in a dirty Rashba semiconductor.

Spintronics is a rapidly developing field, which has the objective to learn more about the interaction of the electron spin with its solid state environment. It is stimulated by the fact that the electron spin can also be manipulated electrically and thus be utilized in electrical devices. The interaction, which provides access to electric spin manipulation is the spin-orbit interaction, which is realized by the Rashba interaction in the simplest situation[1].

The injection of spins into nonmagnetic semiconductors, however, has proven to be a difficult task. Therefore, much attention is paid to the investigation of effects, which permit the electrical creation of non-vanishing magnetizations in the sample. Already the first investigations on the impact of a lateral electric field on a two-dimensional Rashba semiconductor have shown that such effects in principle exist[2]. According to Ref.[2], e.g., the lateral field leads to a homogeneous magnetization in the two-dimensional plane. Similar results have been obtained in the Refs.[3] and [4] recently.

An effect, which might be useful in creating non-vanishing magnetizations, is the spin-Hall effect. The latter manifests itself in a non-vanishing magnetization at the sample boundaries in the presence of an electric field. In that it differs from the spin accumulation, which is present in the bulk. Whereas there seems to be some agreement over the magnitude of the spin accumulation in a Rashba semiconductor, the spin-Hall effect is still a rather controversial issue. On the one hand an intrinsic spin-Hall effect has been suggested in the Refs.[5] and [6] and investigated further in a number of papers. These authors argue, that the expectation value of the spin-current operator, defined by the equation

$$\hat{J}_{ik} = \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{v}_i, \sigma_k \}, \quad (1)$$

is non-vanishing in a clean Rashba semiconductor in the presence of an electric field F , and that therefore a magnetization is created at the boundaries. ($\hat{v}_i$ is the velocity operator, σ_k are the Pauli matrices, $i = 1, 2$, $k = 1, 2, 3$. The indices 1 and 2 and the labels x and y are used simultaneously to characterize the vectors in the 2-d plane, the index 3 and the label z to characterize the perpendicular direction). The spin-Hall conductivity, defined by the ratio $\sigma_H = J_{yz}/F$, is universal in clean systems,

that is independent of the magnitude of the Rashba interaction. In dirty systems, in which the Rashba level splitting is small compared to the disorder energy, the spin-Hall conductivity vanishes[7, 8, 9]. Thus, it is expected that there is no spin-Hall effect in such systems. On the other hand spin-Hall effect has been discussed in Ref. [10] in the hopping regime. Doing so, it has been assumed that the Rashba level splitting can be ignored. Thus, the system of Ref. [10] is always in the dirty limit.

When investigating the differences between the approaches of the Refs. [5]-[9] and the approach of Ref. [10] we note the following: whereas a diffusion equation for the spin density has been derived in Ref.[10] the conclusions of the Refs.[5]-[9] are based only on the investigation of the spin-current tensor (1). However, it is unclear how the tensor (1) is related to observable quantities[11]. Therefore, there are no predictions of the magnitude of the magnetization at the sample boundaries. Moreover, the expectation value of the spin-current is non-vanishing even in equilibrium[11]. This fact raises the question whether the spin-current tensor is well defined at all [11]. In Ref.[10], by contrast, the spin-current tensor has been read off from the diffusion equation. To this end, the authors of Ref.[10] have taken the point of view, that all terms, which can be cast into the form of a derivative, contribute to the divergence of the spin-current tensor. Using this approach they calculate the solution to the spin-diffusion equation and make detailed predictions to the magnitude of the magnetization at the sample boundaries. However, also this approach is not unproblematic. Since the diffusion equations yields only the divergence of the spin-current tensor, the tensor read off from the diffusion equation is only determined up to a curl and boundary currents had to be assumed to be non-existent at all. Moreover, the spin accumulation has entirely been ignored.

Since there seems to be no rigorous method, which could be used to define the spin-current tensor unambiguously, there seems to be no other way than to investigate the consequences of the definition (1) and to compare them with experiments. According to Ref.[10] the spin-current tensor determines the boundary conditions in the diffusive regime. Thus, it is natural to focus on boundary effects. To get further insight into the implications of the definition (1) and into the ques-

tion, in which way the spin current tensor determines the boundary conditions, we investigate the magnetization in a dirty Rashba semiconductor in a half plane. To this end we derive spin-diffusion equations for a two dimensional system and solve these equations subjected to the boundary condition that the spin-current tensor vanishes at the boundary.

Diffusion equations, which also take into account the coupling between spins and charges, have been first derived in the Refs.[4] and [9]. Here, we use the same method as in Ref.[9]. The Hamiltonian is given by the equation

$$H = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}^2}{2m} - (\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{N} \times \hat{\mathbf{p}}) + V(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2)$$

Here $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ is the momentum operator, $\mathbf{N} = N\mathbf{e}_z$, and m is the effective mass. $V(\mathbf{x})$ is a random potential with Gaussian distribution function, zero mean and standard deviation

$$\langle \langle V(\mathbf{x})V(\mathbf{x}') \rangle \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2\pi\nu\tau} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'). \quad (3)$$

ν is the density of states per spin and τ the single particle relaxation time. The propagation of single particle excitations is described by the retarded and advanced Green's functions. These functions are the solution to the equation

$$((\pm i\frac{\hbar s}{2} + E)\mathbf{1} - H)G^{R/A}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'|E, s) = \mathbf{1}\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'). \quad (4)$$

Here $\mathbf{1}$ is the 2×2 unit matrix, s is a fixed frequency, and E is the total particle energy. For the calculation of their configuration averages we use the self-consistent Born approximation. In this approximation the Fourier-transform $g^R(\mathbf{k}|E, s)$ of the configuration averaged retarded Green's functions $\bar{G}^R(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|E, s)$ is given by the equation

$$g^R(\mathbf{k}|E, s) = g_+(\mathbf{k}|E, s)g_-(\mathbf{k}|E, s) \times (g^{-1}(\mathbf{k}|E, s)\mathbf{1} - (\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{p})), \quad (5)$$

where $g_{\pm}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}|E, s) = i\hbar s/2 + E - E_{\pm}(k) + i\hbar/2\tau$, $E_{\pm}(k) = \hbar^2 k^2/2m \pm |N|\hbar k$ and $g(\mathbf{k}|E, s) = g_+(\mathbf{k}|E, s)|_{N=0}$. The Fourier transform $g^A(\mathbf{k}|E, s)$ of the configuration averaged advanced Green's function $\bar{G}^A(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|E, s)$ is obtained from Eq.(3) by hermitian conjugation.

The evolution of the particle density and the spin density is described by a generalized diffusion equation. The densities are defined by the relationship

$$f_{\alpha\alpha'}(\mathbf{x}|E, t) = \text{tr}(\psi_{\alpha}^+(\mathbf{x}, t)\psi_{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x}, t)\rho_0(E)), \quad (6)$$

where $\psi_{\alpha}^+(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\psi_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ are creation and annihilation operators for particles with spin α , and $\rho_0(E)$ is the initial density matrix. The particle density is given by the equation $n(\mathbf{x}|E, t) = \text{tr}f(\mathbf{x}|E, t)$, the spin density by

the relationship $S_i(\mathbf{x}|E, t) = \text{tr}(\sigma_i f(\mathbf{x}|E, t))$. Note, that this definition differs from the conventional definition by a factor $2/\hbar$. The equation of motion for the quantity f takes the form

$$\int d\mathbf{x}_1 \Gamma_{\alpha'\alpha_2}^{\alpha\alpha_1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_1|E, s)f_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}(\mathbf{x}_1|E, s) = f_{\alpha\alpha'}^0(\mathbf{x}|E) \quad (7)$$

after Laplace transformation with respect to times ($t \rightarrow s$). A summation with respect to double indices has to be performed. The quantity $f_{\alpha\alpha'}^0(\mathbf{x}|E)$ is the initial condition. The kernel Γ in Eq.(7) is given by the equation

$$\tau\Gamma_{\alpha'\alpha_2}^{\alpha\alpha_1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'|E, s) = \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')\delta_{\alpha\alpha_1}\delta_{\alpha'\alpha_2} - \frac{\hbar}{2\pi\nu\tau}\bar{G}_{\alpha\alpha_1}^R(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|E, s)\bar{G}_{\alpha_2\alpha'}^A(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}|E, s) \quad (8)$$

in the ladder approximation. To simplify Eq.(7) we use the hydrodynamics expansion. Doing so, we obtain the following diffusion equations after an inverse Laplace transformation

$$\frac{dn}{dt} - D\Delta n + \Omega\tau(\mathbf{N} \times \nabla, \mathbf{S}) = 0 \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbf{S}}{dt} + \Omega \cdot \mathbf{S} - D\Delta \mathbf{S} - \omega_s(\mathbf{N} \times \nabla) \times \mathbf{S} \\ + \Omega\tau\mathbf{N} \times \nabla n = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

These equations agree with those of Ref.[9]. Here $D = E\tau/m$ is the diffusion coefficient, $\omega_s = 4mD/\hbar$ and $\Omega_{ik} = \Omega\delta_{ik}(1 + \delta_{i3})$, where $\Omega = 4m^2N^2D/\hbar^2$.

To calculate the spin-current density we use the expression

$$J_{ik}(\mathbf{x}|E, s) = \frac{\hbar}{2\pi\nu\tau} \text{tr} \int d\mathbf{y} \bar{G}^A(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|E, 0)\hat{J}_{ik} \times \bar{G}^R(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|E, 0)f(\mathbf{y}|E, s), \quad (11)$$

which is valid in the ladder approximation, provided we are interested in time scales which are large compared to τ [4]. To simplify the integral we use the same hydrodynamic expansion as before. Doing so, we obtain the following expressions for components of the spin-current tensor

$$J_{xx} = -D\nabla_x S_x - \frac{N\omega_s}{2}S_z, \quad (12)$$

$$J_{xy} = -D\nabla_x S_y + \Omega\tau Nn, \quad (13)$$

$$J_{xz} = -D\nabla_x S_z + \frac{N\omega_s}{2}S_x - \frac{\omega_s\tau N^2}{2}\nabla_y n, \quad (14)$$

$$J_{yx} = -D\nabla_y S_x - \Omega\tau Nn, \quad (15)$$

$$J_{yy} = -D\nabla_y - \frac{N\omega_s}{2}S_z, \quad (16)$$

and

$$J_{yz} = -D\nabla_y S_z + \frac{N\omega_s}{2} S_y + \frac{\omega_s N^2 \tau}{2} \nabla_x n. \quad (17)$$

Now we compare the Eqs.(12)-(17) with those which would be obtained, if we would simply read off the spin-current tensor from the divergence of the diffusion equation, as suggested in Ref.[10]. Doing so, we note the following: while the result for J_{xy} and J_{yx} is in both cases the same, the results for the remaining components of the spin-current tensor are different from each other (Note, that the fifth term on the lhs of Eq.(10) can also be written as the divergence of a second rank tensor). There are two reasons for the differences. Firstly, the third term in the Eqs.(14) and (17) has just the form of a curl and thus can never be retrieved from the diffusion equation. Secondly, the terms linear in N in the Eqs.(12)-(17) differ from those in the diffusion equation by a factor 1/2. This factor can be traced back to the following fact: the second, the third and the fourth term in Eq.(10) can be written in the form $(\Omega \cdot \mathbf{S} - D\Delta \mathbf{S} - \omega_s(\mathbf{N} \times \nabla))_l = D_{ilm} D D_{imk} S_k$, where

$$D_{ilm} = \delta_{lm} \nabla_i + \frac{2Nm}{\hbar} \epsilon_{lkm} \epsilon_{kiz} \quad (18)$$

is the covariant derivative, the image of the velocity operator in the diffusion formalism. Thus, the spin diffusion equation (10) has a similar structure as the time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau equation. In Eq.(10) the magnetic field is replaced by the second term on the rhs of Eq.(18). Collecting all terms, which are proportional to the derivative, means counting the connection form twice, a fact which is known to be incorrect from the Ginzburg-Landau equation.

The Eqs.(12)-(17) differ from those of Ref.[4] in the second term on the rhs of the Eqs.(13) and (15). This term is absent in Ref.[4]. However, it has important consequences: since the particle density does not vanish at the boundary the magnetization can not be zero there. To investigate this point further we now focus on the situation in the half plane $y > 0$. Doing so, we ignore the impact of the spin-orbit interaction on the particle density[12]. First we focus on the situation in equilibrium. In this case $\nabla_x = 0$, $d/dt = 0$ and the particle density n is equal to a constant n_0 . Solving the spin-diffusion equation (10) subjected to the boundary condition $J_{yk}|_{y=0} = 0$ yields $S_y = S_z = 0$ and

$$S_x = \tau N n_0 \sqrt{\frac{\Omega}{D}} \exp(-\sqrt{\frac{\Omega}{D}} y). \quad (19)$$

Thus, S_x is non-vanishing at the boundary. If instead of half plane we would have chosen a strip of finite width $2b$ we would have obtained

$$S_x = -\tau N n_0 \sqrt{\frac{\Omega}{D}} \frac{\sinh(\sqrt{\frac{\Omega}{D}} y)}{\cosh(\sqrt{\frac{\Omega}{D}} b)} \quad (20)$$

instead.

Now we bias the system. To this end we use the method of Ref. [4], that is instead of switching on a true electric field we introduce a concentration gradient. In this case the stationary solution to the particle diffusion equation is given by $n(x) = n_0 + n_1 x$. The presence of n_1 leads to a spin-accumulation, as discussed in Ref.[4]. Due to n_1 we obtain $S_x = S_z = 0$ and $S_y = S_{bulk} = -n_1 \tau N$ in the bulk. Despite this fact, the spin-Hall current vanishes in the absence of a boundary, since the second term on the rhs of Eq.(17) cancels the third. To investigate the situation in a half-plane we impose again the boundary condition $J_{yk}|_{y=0} = 0$. In this case, we obtain

$$S_z = -S_{bulk} \text{sgn} N \text{Re}\left(\frac{(1 + \lambda^{*2})(1 - \lambda^2)(\lambda^* - 1)}{\lambda^* - \lambda} \exp(-\lambda \sqrt{\frac{\Omega}{D}} y)\right) \quad (21)$$

Here $\lambda = \sqrt{-1/2 + i\sqrt{7/4}}$, and $*$ is complex conjugation. The result for S_x agrees with Eq.(19) up to a replacement $n_0 \rightarrow n(x)$. If instead of the half plane we consider a strip of finite width we obtain again a result which is antisymmetric with respect to y .

Here, however, the question arises what the source of the spin-Hall effect is, if the spin-Hall current vanishes in the bulk. The answer is, that the spin-Hall effect is not driven by the spin-Hall current, but by the equilibrium magnetization, thus finally by J_{yx} . Once the magnetization exists the field induced rotation (the fourth term in Eq.(10)) turns the magnetization into the z -direction if the system is biased.

The existence of the equilibrium magnetization, however, can not be reconciled with time reversal invariance. The only way to restore time reversal symmetry is to assume that the spin-current density has a discontinuity at the sample boundary. The discontinuity results from the coupling of the particle spin to the particle momentum, which is provided by the electron spectrum. Owing to the coupling the spins of the particles running toward the boundary are mainly aligned in positive x -direction. The particles, which are reflected at the sample boundary have their spins aligned in the opposite direction. Thus, the spins flip when the particles are scattered elastically at the boundary. This fact has to be taken into account in the interpretation of the spin-current tensor (1). Whereas the electric current across the boundary is a measure for the difference between the number of particles running toward the boundary and the number of particles reflected at the boundary the spin current tensor (1) is actually a measure for the sum of both, for the number of particles running toward the boundary and the number of particles reflected at the boundary. Therefore, the spin-current tensor (1) does not characterize a flux of spins across the boundary in the conventional sense in the Rashba model and jumps at the sample boundary. The correct boundary condition is $\mathbf{S}|_{\text{boundary}} = 0$ in the

present situation. In this case there is neither an equilibrium magnetization nor a spin-Hall effect in a dirty Rashba semiconductor.

Clearly, at this point the question arises why there should be a non-vanishing spin-Hall effect in an electric field in the same model in the clean limit, in which the energy level splitting due to the Rashba interaction is large compared to the disorder energy. The electric field itself does not affect the time reversal invariance. The boundary condition, however, does in this case. Despite this fact energy conservation requires that the spins have flipped when the particles have been reflected elastically at the sample boundary, at least if the particles are separated from the boundary by a distance of the order of the mean free path. Consequently, we expect that the spin accumulation is confined to a thin layer, which has at most a width of the order of the mean free path.

In summary, we have shown that the assumption that the spin-current tensor is continuous at the sample boundary leads to results, which are in contradiction to time reversal symmetry. The only way to reconcile our results with time reversal symmetry is to assume, that the spin-current tensor has a jump at the sample boundary. The existence of the jump can be traced back to the coupling between spin and charge. We would like to stress that our results are specific to systems with Rashba spin-orbit interaction and do not apply to systems, in which the spin-orbit interaction is produced by the scattering at impurities. The latter differ from the systems discussed here in that there is no coupling between spin

and momentum in the spectrum.

* Electronic address: olaf.bleibaum@physik.uni-magdeburg.de

- [1] I. Zutic, J. Fabian and S. Das Sarma, Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 323 (2004).
- [2] V. M. Edelstein, Solid State Comm. **73**, 233 (1990).
- [3] Jun-ichiro Inoue, G. E. W. Bauer, L. W. Molenkamp, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 033104 (2003).
- [4] E. G. Mishenko, A. V. Shytov, and B. I. Halperin, cond-mat/0406730.
- [5] J. Sinova, D. Culcer, Q. Niu, N. A. Sinitsyn, T. Jungwirth, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 126603 (2004).
- [6] S. Murakami, N. Nagaosa, and S. C. Zhang, Science **301**, 1348 (2003).
- [7] J. Schliemann and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 165315 (2004).
- [8] Jun-ichiro Inoue, G. E. W. Bauer and L. W. Molenkamp, cond-mat/0402242v1.
- [9] A. A. Burkov, A. S. Nunez, and A. H. MacDonald, cond-mat/0311328.
- [10] T. Damker, H. Böttger and V. V. Bryksin, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 205327 (2004).
- [11] E. I. Rashba, cond-mat/0408119v1.
- [12] A consideration of the impact of the spin-orbit interaction on the particle density does not effect any of our arguments. It leads to a weak accumulation of charge carriers at the boundary, which does not affect the final result.